

Application No. 09/754,325  
Reply to Office Action of Nov. 5, 2003 and  
Supplemental to the Feb. 5, 2004 Amendment

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have filed this supplemental response to clarify two statements made in its February 05, 2004 amendment. First, with regard to the first complete paragraph on page 7 of the amendment, Applicants would like to clarify with regard to Lee et al. that in the event conductivity type of the first conductive layer is different from that of the first and second wells 91 and 101, electrical connection cannot be established due to a PN junction. In the present invention, the first conductive layer has the same conductivity type as the prescribed conductivity of the first and second wells for electrically connecting the first and second wells.

Second, with regard to the second complete paragraph on page 7 of the amendment, the fourth line should recite "Suzuki is" and not --Lee et al. are--.

An early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599  
W. Todd Baker  
Registration No. 45,265

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)